

Nonstandard coproducts and the Izergin-Korepin open spin chain

Rafael I. Nepomechie

Physics Department, P.O. Box 248046, University of Miami

Coral Gables, FL 33124 USA

Abstract

Corresponding to the Izergin-Korepin ($A_2^{(2)}$) R matrix, there are three diagonal solutions (“ K matrices”) of the boundary Yang-Baxter equation. Using these R and K matrices, one can construct transfer matrices for open integrable quantum spin chains. The transfer matrix corresponding to the identity matrix $K = \mathbb{I}$ is known to have $U_q(o(3))$ symmetry. We argue here that the transfer matrices corresponding to the other two K matrices also have $U_q(o(3))$ symmetry, but with a nonstandard coproduct. We briefly explore some of the consequences of this symmetry.

1 Introduction and summary

The notion of coproduct is of fundamental importance in the theory of representations of algebras. Given a representation of an algebra on a vector space V , the coproduct Δ determines the representation on the tensor product space $V \otimes V$. For a classical Lie algebra, the coproduct is trivial: for any generator x , the coproduct is $\Delta(x) = x \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes x$, where $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity matrix. For quantum algebras, the situation is more interesting. Indeed, consider the case $U_q(su(2))$, with a set of three generators $\{j_{\pm}, h\}$ obeying

$$[h, j_{\pm}] = \pm j_{\pm}. \quad (1)$$

As is well known, the “standard” coproduct

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(h) &= h \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes h, \\ \Delta(j_{\pm}) &= j_{\pm} \otimes q^h + q^{-h} \otimes j_{\pm}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

is compatible with the commutation relation

$$[j_+, j_-] = \frac{q^{2h} - q^{-2h}}{q - q^{-1}}. \quad (3)$$

Perhaps less well-known is the fact that there is also a “nonstandard” coproduct

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(h) &= h \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes h, \\ \Delta(j_{\pm}) &= j_{\pm} \otimes \mathbb{I} + q^h \otimes j_{\pm}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

which is compatible instead with the q -commutation relation

$$j_+ j_- - q^{-1} j_- j_+ = \frac{\mathbb{I} - q^{2h}}{1 - q^2}. \quad (5)$$

Remarkably, both of these types of coproducts can be realized in the open integrable quantum spin chain constructed with the $A_2^{(2)}$ R matrix [1] by choosing appropriate boundary conditions. Let us briefly recall the history of this model. Sklyanin [2] pioneered the generalization of the Quantum Inverse Scattering Method [3] to systems with boundaries, and showed that integrable boundary conditions can be obtained from solutions $K(u)$ of the boundary Yang-Baxter equation [4], [5]. This approach was then generalized [6] to spin chains associated with general affine Lie algebras [7], [8]. In particular, for the $A_2^{(2)}$ case, it was found [9] that there are only three diagonal solutions of the boundary Yang-Baxter equation:

$$K^{(0)}(u) = \mathbb{I} = \text{diag}(1, 1, 1),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
K^{(1)}(u) &= \text{diag}\left(e^{-u}, \frac{\sinh(\frac{1}{2}(3\eta - \frac{i\pi}{2} + u))}{\sinh(\frac{1}{2}(3\eta - \frac{i\pi}{2} - u))}, e^u\right), \\
K^{(2)}(u) &= \text{diag}\left(e^{-u}, \frac{\cosh(\frac{1}{2}(3\eta - \frac{i\pi}{2} + u))}{\cosh(\frac{1}{2}(3\eta - \frac{i\pi}{2} - u))}, e^u\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where u is the spectral parameter, and η is the anisotropy parameter. Let us denote the corresponding transfer matrices for open quantum spin chains with N sites by $t^{(i)}(u)$, $i = 0, 1, 2$. (The construction of these transfer matrices is described below in Section 2.) It was shown in [10], [11] that the transfer matrix $t^{(0)}(u)$ constructed with the identity matrix $K^{(0)}$ has $U_q(o(3))$ symmetry:

$$[t^{(0)}(u), S^\pm] = 0, \quad [t^{(0)}(u), S^3] = 0, \tag{7}$$

where the generators obey

$$[S^3, S^\pm] = \pm S^\pm, \quad [S^+, S^-] = \frac{q^{2S^3} - q^{-2S^3}}{q - q^{-1}}, \tag{8}$$

and

$$S^\pm = \sum_{k=1}^N q^{s_N^3 + \dots + s_{k+1}^3} s_k^\pm q^{-(s_{k-1}^3 + \dots + s_1^3)}, \quad S^3 = \sum_{k=1}^N s_k^3, \tag{9}$$

where

$$s^+ = \sqrt{2 \cosh \eta} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad s^- = \sqrt{2 \cosh \eta} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad s^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & 0 & \\ & & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

and $q = e^\eta$. That is, the transfer matrix has quantum algebra symmetry with the “standard” coproduct (2). This is a generalization of the observation [12], [13] of $U_q(su(2))$ symmetry for the $A_1^{(1)}$ case. Batchelor and Yung [14] later showed that the open $A_2^{(2)}$ spin chain can be mapped to the problem of polymers at surfaces, and that the above three solutions $K^{(i)}(u)$ correspond to three distinct surface critical behaviors.

There has remained the question: what symmetry – if any – do the transfer matrices constructed with $K^{(1)}$ and $K^{(2)}$ have? Naively, one expects that since $K \neq \mathbb{I}$, there is less symmetry.¹ However, this is *not* the case. We argue here that the transfer matrices $t^{(1)}(u)$ and $t^{(2)}(u)$ also have $U_q(o(3))$ symmetry, but with a “nonstandard” coproduct (4):

$$[t^{(i)}(u), S^\pm] = 0, \quad [t^{(i)}(u), S^3] = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \tag{11}$$

¹This expectation holds true for the $A_n^{(1)}$ case [15]. Indeed, there the diagonal K matrices contain an additional continuous parameter ξ ; and $K = \mathbb{I}$ is a point ($\xi \rightarrow \infty$) of enhanced symmetry.

where the generators obey

$$[S^3, S^\pm] = \pm 2S^\pm, \quad S^+ S^- - q^{-2} S^- S^+ = \frac{\mathbb{I} - q^{2S^3}}{1 - q^2}, \quad (12)$$

and

$$S^\pm = \sum_{k=1}^N s_k^\pm q^{s_{k-1}^3 + \dots + s_1^3}, \quad S^3 = \sum_{k=1}^N s_k^3, \quad (13)$$

where

$$s^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad s^- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad s^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & 0 & \\ & & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

and $q = e^{4\eta}$. Knowledge of such symmetry is essential for understanding important features of the models such as degeneracies of the spectrum and the Bethe Ansatz solution. Eqs. (11) - (14) are the main results of this Letter. In Section 2 we provide some pertinent details about the construction and symmetry of the models, and we conclude in Section 3 with a brief discussion.

2 Some details

In this Section, we briefly review the construction of the transfer matrices, and outline the argument for their symmetry. The solution $R(u)$ of the Yang-Baxter equation found by Izergin and Korepin [1], which corresponds [7],[8] to the case $A_2^{(2)}$, can be written in the following form [16], [11]

$$R(u) = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{array}{c|c|c} c & & \\ & b & e \\ & d & g \\ \hline \bar{e} & b & g \\ & \bar{g} & a \\ & & b \\ \hline \bar{f} & \bar{g} & d \\ & \bar{e} & b \\ & & c \end{array} \end{pmatrix} \quad (15)$$

where

$$a = \sinh(u - 3\eta) - \sinh 5\eta + \sinh 3\eta + \sinh \eta, \quad b = \sinh(u - 3\eta) + \sinh 3\eta,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c &= \sinh(u - 5\eta) + \sinh \eta, & d &= \sinh(u - \eta) + \sinh \eta, \\
e &= -2e^{-\frac{u}{2}} \sinh 2\eta \cosh(\frac{u}{2} - 3\eta), & \bar{e} &= -2e^{\frac{u}{2}} \sinh 2\eta \cosh(\frac{u}{2} - 3\eta), \\
f &= -2e^{-u+2\eta} \sinh \eta \sinh 2\eta - e^{-\eta} \sinh 4\eta, & \bar{f} &= 2e^{u-2\eta} \sinh \eta \sinh 2\eta - e^{\eta} \sinh 4\eta, \\
g &= 2e^{-\frac{u}{2}+2\eta} \sinh \frac{u}{2} \sinh 2\eta, & \bar{g} &= -2e^{\frac{u}{2}-2\eta} \sinh \frac{u}{2} \sinh 2\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

It has the regularity property $R(0) \propto \mathcal{P}$, where $\mathcal{P}$ is the permutation matrix, as well as unitarity, PT symmetry, and crossing symmetry

$$R_{12}(u) = V_1 R_{12}(-u - \rho)^{t_2} V_1 = V_2^{t_2} R_{12}(-u - \rho)^{t_1} V_2^{t_2}, \quad (16)$$

where the crossing matrix V is given by

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} & -e^{-\eta} \\ & 1 \\ -e^{\eta} & \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

and $\rho = -6\eta - i\pi$.

Given a solution $K(u)$ of the boundary Yang-Baxter equation, a corresponding transfer matrix $t(u)$ for an open integrable quantum spin chain with N sites is given by [2], [6], [15]

$$t(u) = \text{tr}_0 M_0 K_0(-u - \rho)^{t_0} \mathcal{T}_0(u), \quad (18)$$

where

$$\mathcal{T}_0(u) = T_0(u) K_0(u) \hat{T}_0(u), \quad (19)$$

with

$$T_0(u) = R_{0N}(u) \cdots R_{01}(u), \quad \hat{T}_0(u) = R_{10}(u) \cdots R_{N0}(u), \quad (20)$$

and

$$M = V^t V = \text{diag}(e^{2\eta}, 1, e^{-2\eta}). \quad (21)$$

Indeed, the transfer matrix forms a one-parameter commutative family $[t(u), t(v)] = 0$, which contains the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$,

$$\mathcal{H} \propto \left. \frac{d}{du} t(u) \right|_{u=0}. \quad (22)$$

For the three K matrices $K^{(i)}(u)$ given in Eq. (6), we denote by $t^{(i)}(u)$ the corresponding transfer matrices, and by $\mathcal{H}^{(i)}$ the corresponding Hamiltonians. We now restrict our attention

to the cases $i = 1, 2$. For 2 sites ($N = 2$), we have checked the $U_q(o(3))$ symmetry (11) - (14) of the transfer matrix by direct computation. In particular, Eq. (22) implies that the 2-site Hamiltonian also has this symmetry. For general N , the Hamiltonian is given by a sum of 2-site Hamiltonians plus boundary terms. It follows that, for general N , the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}^{(i)}$ has $U_q(o(3))$ symmetry

$$[\mathcal{H}^{(i)}, S^\pm] = 0, \quad [\mathcal{H}^{(i)}, S^3] = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (23)$$

where the symmetry generators obey (12) - (14). We have also checked the symmetry (11) of the transfer matrix for 3 sites ($N = 3$) by direct computation, and we conjecture that it holds for general N .

We remark that the symmetry generators $S^\pm, S^3$ defined in (13), (14) lie in the fundamental algebraic structures of QISM. Indeed, note the asymptotic behavior of the R and K matrices for $u \rightarrow \infty$:

$$R(u) \sim e^u R^+ + R^{++} + O(e^{-u}), \quad (24)$$

$$K^{(i)}(u) \sim e^u K^{(i)+} + K^{(i)++} + O(e^{-u}), \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (25)$$

where $R^+, R^{++}, K^{(i)+}, K^{(i)++}$ are independent of u . It follows that the quantity $\mathcal{T}^{(i)}(u)$ defined as in Eq. (19) has the asymptotic behavior for $u \rightarrow \infty$

$$\mathcal{T}^{(i)}(u) \sim e^{(2N+1)u} \mathcal{T}^{(i)+} + e^{2Nu} \mathcal{T}^{(i)++} + \dots, \quad (26)$$

where $\mathcal{T}^{(i)+}, \mathcal{T}^{(i)++}$ are independent of u . The basic observation is that the generators $S^\pm$ lie in the antidiagonal corners of $\mathcal{T}^{(i)++}$ (viewed as a 3×3 auxiliary-space matrix, with operator-valued entries):

$$\mathcal{T}^{(i)++} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & S^- \\ 0 & * & * \\ S^+ & * & * \end{pmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

We expect that this observation will be useful for formulating a QISM proof of the symmetry (11).

3 Discussion

One immediate consequence of the symmetry which we have uncovered is the explanation of degeneracies in the spectrum for finite N . For instance, consider the pseudovacuum vector

$$\omega = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}^{\otimes N},$$

$$t^{(i)}(u) \omega = \Lambda^{(i)}(u) \omega, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (28)$$

where $\Lambda^{(i)}(u)$ is the corresponding pseudovacuum eigenvalue. Commutativity of the transfer matrix with S^- implies that the vectors $(S^-)^n \omega$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$ are also eigenvectors of the transfer matrix with the same eigenvalue. Moreover, we observe that each site carries a *reducible* representation of the $U_q(o(3))$ algebra, namely $\mathbf{2} \oplus \mathbf{1}$ (instead of $\mathbf{3}$), implying the degeneracy pattern $(\mathbf{2} \oplus \mathbf{1})^{\otimes N}$.

Note that the pseudovacuum vector ω is annihilated by S^+ ; that is, $S^+ \omega = 0$. We expect that all Bethe Ansatz states (which can presumably be constructed by applying appropriate creation-like operators to ω) are such highest-weight states. (See, e.g., [17], [10], [18], [19].)

Finally, we remark that we have considered here only the first of the infinite family of models $A_{2n}^{(2)}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. For these R matrices [7], [8], there are again only three distinct diagonal solutions of the boundary Yang-Baxter equation: $K^{(0)} = \mathbb{I}$ [9], and $K^{(1)}$, $K^{(2)}$ given in [20]. The transfer matrix constructed with $K^{(0)}$ has [10] the symmetry $U_q(o(2n+1))$ with the standard coproduct. We expect that the transfer matrices constructed with $K^{(1)}$ and $K^{(2)}$ also have $U_q(o(2n+1))$ symmetry, but with a nonstandard coproduct. We hope to report on this and related matters in a future publication.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to O. Alvarez for his helpful comments. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant PHY-9870101.

References

- [1] A.G. Izergin and V.E. Korepin, Commun. Math. Phys. *79* (1981) 303.
- [2] E.K. Sklyanin, J. Phys. *A21* (1988) 2375.
- [3] V.E. Korepin, N.M. Bogoliubov, and A.G. Izergin, *Quantum Inverse Scattering Method, Correlation Functions and Algebraic Bethe Ansatz* (Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- [4] I.V. Cherednik, Theor. Math. Phys. *61* (1984) 977.

- [5] S. Ghoshal and A. B. Zamolodchikov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. *A9* (1994) 3841; *A9* (1994) 4353.
- [6] L. Mezincescu and R.I. Nepomechie, J. Phys. *A24* (1991) L17.
- [7] V.V. Bazhanov, Phys. Lett. *159B* (1985) 321; Commun. Math. Phys. *113* (1987) 471.
- [8] M. Jimbo, Commun. Math. Phys. *102* (1986) 537; *Lecture Notes in Physics*, Vol. 246, (Springer, 1986), p. 335.
- [9] L. Mezincescu and R.I. Nepomechie, Int. J. Mod. Phys. *A6* (1991) 5231; *A7* (1992) 5657.
- [10] L. Mezincescu and R.I. Nepomechie, Mod. Phys. Lett. *A6* (1991) 2497.
- [11] L. Mezincescu and R.I. Nepomechie, Nucl. Phys. *B372* (1992) 597.
- [12] V. Pasquier and H. Saleur, Nucl. Phys. *B330* (1990) 523.
- [13] P.P. Kulish and E.K. Sklyanin, J. Phys. *A24* (1991) L435.
- [14] M.T. Batchelor and C.M. Yung, Nucl. Phys. *B435*, 430 (1995); Phys. Rev. Lett. *74* (1995) 2026.
- [15] A. Doikou and R.I. Nepomechie, Nucl. Phys. *B530* (1998) 641.
- [16] P.P. Kulish and E.K. Sklyanin, J. Sov. Math. *19* (1982) 1596.
- [17] L.D. Faddeev and L.A. Takhtajan, J. Sov. Math. *24* (1984) 241.
- [18] H.J. de Vega and A. González-Ruiz, Phys. Lett. *B332* (1994) 123, hep-th/9405023
- [19] A. Förster and M. Karowski, Nucl. Phys. *B408* (1993) 512; M. Karowski and A. Zapletal, J. Phys. *A27* (1994) 7419.
- [20] M.T. Batchelor, V. Fridkin, A. Kuniba and Y.K. Zhou, Phys. Lett. *376B* (1996) 266.